REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action dated August 25, 2004. Claims 1-6 have been canceled and new claims 7-24 have been added. New claims do no introduce new matter. Individual issues raised by the Examiner will be addressed next in order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Objection to the Abstract

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the abstract of the disclosure has been objected because it exceeded 150 words. The abstract has been amended as requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests to enter the amended abstract into the record of the application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraphs 3-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6 as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,588,148 to Landis et al. ("Landis"). With respect to this rejection, applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-6 have been canceled, and therefore rejection is moot. Applicant further submits that new claims 7-27 are patentable over Landis at least because the reference fails to teach a server operable to "send to the user a checksum of the collected data," and "to receive from the user an indication of data previously sent", as recited in independent claims 7, 14 and 21 of the present application.

In particular, the Landis reference discloses a system for managing data transfer between computing devices. (*See*, e.g., Abstract). The system provides a data server and a plurality of databases for storing various documents and files. (*See*, e.g., col. 3, ll. 13-18). The system enables client computers to query the data server to retrieve updated documents and files from the databases. (*See*, e.g., col. 3, ll. 21-23). Upon receiving a query, the server retrieves the updated information from the database and transfers it to the client. (*See*, e.g., col. 3, ll. 24-26). The data transmission is governed by a protocol based on a client profile, which defines preferences, capabilities, configuration and other parameters which may effect data transfer between the server and the client computers. (*See*, e.g., col. 3, ll. 42-46).

The Landis reference, however, does not disclose, teach or even suggest that the server is operable to generate and send to the client a checksum of the stored information and to receive from the client an identification of data that has been previously sent by the server, as recited in claims 7, 14 and 21 of the present application. In Landis, the client computer initiates the data transfer by querying the server for a particular data and the server merely

returns the requested data. In contrast, in the present application, the server sends a checksum of the collected data to the user and the user returns to the server an indication of data previously sent, so that only a new data can be send to the client in its entirety. Because Landis fails to teach a client/server system having this functionality, claims 7, 14 and 21 of the present application, as well as all claims dependent thereon, are patentable over Landis.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant submits herewith for consideration by the Patent Office a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement and a list references. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter the cited references into the record of the present application.

Conclusion

In view of the above, applicant submits that claims 7-24 are patentable over the prior art of record, and therefore the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable disposition to that respect is respectfully requested. Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned should he have any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 2, 2005

Michael Farnberg (SB 441)

Ognian V. Shentov Reg. No. 38,051
JONES DAY
222 East 41st Street
New York, New York 10017
(212) 326-3939